

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/666,701	09/19/2003	Chien-Min Sung	T8908.DIV	2841	
7590 02/25/2005			EXAMINER		
THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP			MORGAN, EILEEN P		
P.O. Box 1219 Sandy, UT 84091-1219		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
J,, J. J			3723		
			DATE MAILED: 02/25/2009	DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/666,701	SUNG, CHIEN-MIN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Eileen P Morgan	3723				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 S	eptember 2003.					
·—	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa						
Disposition of Claims		·				
4)  Claim(s) 21-39 and 41-53 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5)  Claim(s) 21-39 is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 41-53 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subjected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the	wn from consideration.  or election requirement.  er.  epted or b) \( \subseteq  objected to by the large drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	is have been received. Is have been received in Application in the second in the secon	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D. 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/666,701

Art Unit: 3723

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

  A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
  - (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 41,43, 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin-5,776,355.

Martin discloses a diamond tool having CVD diamond on the tool with a working surface and an opposite growth surface (col. 2, line 41), wherein the tool can be made with a mold (col. 3, line 50), wherein a non-diamond layer (col. 3, line 23) is formed against the diamond layer.

3. Claims 41, 42, 44,45,53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pryor -5,130,111.

Pryor discloses a CVD diamond tool (col. 6, last line) in which a mold having convex and concave surfaces are used to form a diamond surface and growth surface, and wherein the diamond is attached to non-diamond surfaces such as metal or plastic.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 42,44-50, 52, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, alone.
  - In regard to the surface roughness, surface shape and diamond thickness, this would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at time invention was made dependent on workpiece and in order to achieve desired results. In regard to the use of the tool, (die, dresser, etc.) this would have been an obvious choice since diamond tools are well known for their use in these operations.

Application/Control Number: 10/666,701

Art Unit: 3723

6. Claims 43, 46-52 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pryor, alone.

In regard to the surface roughness, this would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at time invention was made dependent on workpiece and in order to achieve desired results. In regard to the use of the tool, (die, dresser, etc.) this would have been an obvious choice since diamond tools are well known for their use in these operations.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

- 7. Claims 21-39 appear allowable over the prior art of record.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eileen P Morgan whose telephone number is 571.272.4488. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday (Office), Friday (Work at home).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571.272.4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/666,701

Art Unit: 3723

EΜ

February 18, 2005

EILEEN P. MORGAN PRIMARY EXAMINER